

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00065 131913Z

67

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

DRC-01 /151 W

----- 015328

R 131803Z JUN 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 110

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

CONFIDENTIAL MBFR VIENNA 0065

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF JUNE 5, 1974

MEETING BETWEEN POLISH AND FRG REPS

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF MEMO OF BILATERAL MEETING BETWEEN  
FRG REP BEHREND AND COL OSTASZIEWICZ, THE MILITARY ADVISOR  
TO THE POLISH DELEGATION, WHICH WAS CIRCULATED BY FRG REP  
AT JUNE 13 AHG MEETING.

BEGIN TEXT

AT A SOCIAL OCCASION THE MILITARY ADVISER OF THE  
POLISH DELEGATION, COLONEL OSTASZIEWICZ, TOLD AM-  
BASSADOR BEHREND THE FOLLOWING:

1. ONE OF THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE  
THE DIFFERENT STRATEGIC CONCEPTS OF NATO AND WP.  
THE NATO CONCEPT ENVISAGED AN EARLY USE OF TACTICAL  
NUCLEAR WEAPONS. IT WAS SUPPORTED BY A GREAT POTEN-  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00065 131913Z

TIAL OF SUCH WEAPONS. THE WP CONCEPT STRESSED TANKS

BECAUSE UNDER CONDITIONS OF NUCLEAR WARFARE THEY ASSURED THE CAPABILITY OF THE WP FORCES TO SURVIVE AND TO OPERATE. THEREFORE THE SUPERIORITY IN TANKS WAS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE SUPERIORITY OF NATO IN TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

2. THE SUPERIORITY OF WP IN TANKS WAS NOT SO GREAT AS PRETENDED BY NATO STATES. THE WP HAD ONLY ONE BASIC TANK TYPE. ON THE CONTRARY THE NATO HAD FOUR BASIC TANK TYPES AMONG THEM THE ANTITANK TANK, BUT ONLY THE MAIN-BATTLE-TANK IS INCLUDED IN NATO FIGURES.

3. THE SHOCK CAUSED BY THE LAST WAR WAS STILL SO EFFECTIVE IN POLAND THAT FOR POLISH PUBLIC OPINION REDUCTIONS OF FORCES WERE WITHOUT ANY VALUE IF THE BUNDESWEHR WAS NOT INCLUDED. FOR A FIRST AGREEMENT A GERMAN CONTRIBUTION OF TWO OR THREE THOUSAND MEN WOULD BE SUFFICIENT. POLISH DELEGATE WIECZOREK TOLD A MEMBER OF THE GERMAN DELEGATION THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE CHARACTERIZED BY THE EASTERN AND WESTERN PROPOSALS BEING TODAY AS CONTRARY AS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THEREFORE IT WAS NECESSARY TO FIND SOLUTIONS FOR THE PROGRESS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH HAD NO DIRECT REFERENCE TO ONE OF THE PROPOSALS. FIRST, IT WAS NECESSARY TO MOVE AWAY FROM THE OFFICIAL POSITIONS. LATER ON, WHEN THE NEGOTIATIONS HAD MADE PROGRESS ONE HAD NATURALLY TO COME BACK TO THE ORIGINAL POSITIONS.

2. THERE WERE TWO MAIN PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED NOW:  
A) NEW PROPOSALS SEPARATED FROM THE ORIGIANL POSITIONS MUST NOT BE UNEQUAL. THE POLISH DID UNDERSTAND THAT THE SOVIET UNION DID NOT WANT TO REDUCE MORE THAN THE WESTERN SIDE.  
B) IT HAD TO BE FOUND A SOLUTION WITH REALISTIC AMERICAN AND SOVIET REDUCTIONS. WIECZOREK SAID HE HAD ALREADY HEARD IT SOMETIMES THAT THE WESTERN SIDE WAS PERHAPS PREPARED TO COMPENSATE THE HIGHER QUANTITY ON THE EASTERN SIDE BY HIGHER QUALITY ON THE WESTERN SIDE. WIECZOREK ASKED WHY IN THE INFORMAL SESSIONS THE WEST DID NOT MAKE A PROPOSAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00065 131913Z

TO REDUCE NUCLEAR WARHEADS.

3. REFERRING TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL FOR A REVIEW CLAUSE IN A PHASE I AGREEMENT WIECZOREK POINTED OUT THAT THE PROPOSAL WAS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND. THE PURPOSE OF SUCH A PROVISION WAS NOT CLEAR. THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD AGREE ON REDUCTIONS AND TO CARRY THEM OUT BUT NOT TO QUESTION THE RESULTS OF AGREED AND CARRIED OUT REDUCTIONS. IN THE CASE THAT FORCES IN THE

AREA OF REDUCTIONS, FOR INSTANCE SOVIET FORCES, HAD BEEN REDUCED, SUCH A MEASURE COULD NOT BE CANCELLED BECAUSE PARTICIPANTS WERE NOT CONTENT WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE II.

4. WIECZOREK HINTED THAT THE EASTERN DEMAND TO INCLUDE ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS FROM THE OUTSET HAD SOME NUANCES. WHY THE EAST DID NOT INSIST ON REDUCTIONS BY LUXEMBOURG HAD BEEN CLEARLY EXPLAINED. MOREOVER, THE NETHERLANDS HAD NOT BEEN CITED EXPLICITLY IN CHLESTOV'S PLENARY DECLARATION OF MARCH 21. FINALLY, IN HIS LAST PRESS STATEMENT, AMBASSADOR OESER HAD DELIBERATELY NOT MENTIONED CANADA AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. BUT THE REDUCTION OF BELGIAN FORCES FROM THE OUTSET REMAINED IMPORTANT.

END TEXT.RESOR

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** NEGOTIATIONS, MEETING REPORTS, SOCIAL RECEPTIONS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 13 JUN 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974MBFRV00065  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D740153-1046  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740649/aaaabplw.tel  
**Line Count:** 130  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF JUNE 5, 1974 MEETING BETWEEN POLISH AND FRG REPS  
**TAGS:** PARM, GE, PL, NATO, MBFR, (BEHRENDS), (OSTASZIEWICZ)  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005